

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

## **THE EVOLUTION OF THE INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND**

by

Ms. Betty J. Sumpter  
Department of Army Civilian

Dr. Sara Morgan  
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College  
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE <b>30 MAR 2007</b>		2. REPORT TYPE <b>Strategy Research Project</b>		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2006 to 00-00-2007</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Evolution of the Installation Management Agency</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) <b>Betty Sumpter</b>				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <b>See attached.</b>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>21</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

## **ABSTRACT**

AUTHOR: Ms. Betty J. Sumpter  
TITLE: The Evolution of the Installation Management Command  
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project  
DATE: 30 March 2007 WORD COUNT: 6,162 PAGES: 21  
KEY TERMS: Base Operations Support, Transformation  
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom created a need for the Army to examine how we provide base operations support, manage the day to day operations, and administer resources that are allocated for the management of installations. The first lesson learned is "We are fighting two wars simultaneously, which seriously degraded the ability to fund Installations." Next is the realization that transformation of installation management was critical, and Installation management processes were broken and fragmented. This caused the Army to create an organization dedicated solely to the base operations function. That organization was initially called the Installation Management Agency and began as a way to ensure base operations mission, base support dollars, and functions were separated. The Agency has grown since its inception and has run into organizational and resource obstacles along the way. This paper examines the evolution of the Installation Management Agency into a command, why it was developed, how it is being managed, how it is working toward achieving efficiencies and effectiveness and if it should be continued. Recommendations, findings and input from former commanders and the Agency Executive Director indicate that the command is on a pathway to success.



## EVOLUTION OF THE INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Manage Army installations to support readiness and mission execution – provide equitable services and facilities, optimize resources, sustain the environment and enhance the well-being of the Military community.

—Installation Management Command Mission  
Statement 2006

### Impact of IMCOM on Installations

In reconstructing the evolution of the Installation Management Command (IMCOM), it is best to look at it from the perspectives of some of those directly involved from the beginning, examine DoDs thoughts while instituting IMCOM and IMCOMs own retrospective through the years. As you will see, IMCOM is not without its rough spots or its highlights.

### Director, IMCOM Input

The current Executive Director of IMCOM indicates the biggest issue/obstacle in standing up the agency is the “culture” change.” “The Army had been managing installations in a decentralized fashion for many years. Taking the authority away from Major Commands and Senior Mission Commanders made it difficult to get started. Also, due to the same issues, the manpower and funding that was being spent was not transferred to IMA so we could continue at the same service level going in. That has been verified in a recent study that validated that IMCOM only received approximately two-thirds of the money that Major Commands had been spending on installations.”<sup>1</sup>

### Former Garrison Commanders Input

The documented history of Installation Management Command presents a rosy picture. The following input was requested and received from a former Garrison Commander concerning Installation Management Command and the impact it had on his performance.

**Funding.** “Given that we always seem to operate in a ‘resource constrained environment’ funding for installation operations were ‘fenced’ from mission commanders. Base Operations Support (BOS) and Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (SRM) funds were fenced but at the DA level, they were reduced in order to resource Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism requirements. Just as we were going into what had been promised as a benefit, garrison commanders found themselves cutting services due to budget reductions both current and anticipated. With the continuation of Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism, there have been few

discernable changes in management at the garrison level. There were no additional base operations support or SRM funds allocated for Installation Management Command and the perception (in fact, the 'promise' was) that there would be no reductions in resourcing from previous years. This proved not to be the case.

A most recent example of funding issues is the situation with Medical Hold Company billets at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Base Operations Support/SRM funding reductions result in fewer available dollars for commanders, necessitating hard decisions at the garrison/installation level. Clearly, the command had to make a decision on where to use limited Base Operations Support/SRM dollars and the result was below standard billets for returning soldiers. Under further investigation, I am certain that it will be found that renovation of the subject billets was funded in out-years or part of a larger recapitalization or renovation program.

**Organization.** The organization of Installation Management Agency into regions was good; however a number of the 'high visibility' installations, notably Fort Myer, Military District of Washington, Fort Belvoir and West Point fell under the Northeast Region at Fort Monroe, VA. While the Regional Director did (and continues to do) an excellent job at managing this complex environment, the staff sometimes proved inadequate. The perception was that the Installation Management Agency wasn't given the 'first string' of staff, since there were virtually no increases in personnel under the realignment of Installation Management Agency functions under the realignment of Installation Management Agency functions, staffing came from existing organizations based on authorization and function redistribution. In my experience, this meant that we found ourselves working with under qualified personnel at the regional level and often, my staff was educating their regional counterparts on the history of issues or even the nuances of DA policies regarding installation management. Installation Management Agency was stood up 'overnight' and that meant we came into the game with the team on the bench.

The regional organization works well and is based on a proven concept we've had for years in Europe and the Far East. The Base Support Brigade/Battalion (BSB) concept worked very well and it was, frankly, only a matter of time before we applied it here in the Continental United States (CONUS). The organizational structure was familiar to military commanders who rarely have any experience in the area. It also provided for senior personnel to interface with a command (IMA) who managed resources at the DA/DoD level. Great concept. Unfortunately, because of the intricacies and nuances of command level resource management, this necessitated growth of a 'sub-bureaucracy' to manage the resourcing and management

processes. I do not think this was adequately accounted for in the formation of the Installation Management Agency at the Regional and Agency levels.

**Support from the Army.** There was a lot of institutional opposition to the 'Installation Management split' and of course, many of the dissidents felt validated when under resourcing in the initial start up impacted services on the installation. An 'I told you so' attitude from mission commanders did little to create a beneficial environment for garrison commanders and many of my fellow commanders from the 2002-2004 time frames have frankly stated 'I'll never work for Installation Management Agency again!' Even while in command, some commanders openly voiced their concern that Installation Management Agency would even survive the first year (In my opinion, this is one area where astute Installation Management Agency leaders can make headway, while the Army's attention is 'distracted' by Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism, they can find 'maneuver space' to effect moderate changes as long as they result in improvement in the system, with little or no interference from mission commanders).

Overall Army support is vital to the success of installation management. In the future, the installation will, more and more, be the 'launch platform' for our Force. The need for standardization of services, deployment operations and expansion capabilities are all part of where we need to focus Installation Management Agency efforts.

**Standardization of Installation Support.** The goal of standardizing installation support is a great idea that was poorly thought out and executed in the 2002-2004 timeframe. The Installation Management Agency touted standardization as a primary purpose of Installation Management Agency establishment (with the 'fencing' of installations funds the other 'long pole'). However, with the identification of base levels of support many installations lost capabilities they had known before. Some examples of this were: reduction in Fitness Center hours; loss of capacity at Child Care facilities; increased but unresourced services (i.e. Child Care), etc. Little regard seemed to be given to the fact that disparities in installation support did truly exist and that those disparities were caused by factors as varying as the personalities of commanders, personalities of spouses, desires of single versus married soldiers, etc.

In the Information Management area (DOIM) this was exacerbated by the establishment of Army Network Command (NETCOM) which was conducted simultaneously with the Installation Management Agency transition. Fundamental questions were left unanswered: who was responsible for DOIM operations: To what level were the Installation Management Agency and Network Command involved? What was the 'supporting/supported' relationship between Installation Management Agency and Network Command and how would this impact tenant

organizations? Both the Installation Management Command and the Department of the Army G6 were silent on these issues.

Standardization of installation support is a cornerstone of the Army's vision for Installation Management and this should be addressed to ensure future success.”<sup>2</sup>

#### Input Former Commander, Now Commandant (AMSC)

A former Commander in Japan and currently Commandant at the Army Management Staff College (AMSC) had the following to contribute:

**Funding.** “IMA was the right thing to do at the wrong time, but necessary. We were fighting 2 wars simultaneously which seriously degraded the ability to fund the installations. As war progressed, funding during the second and third year became very lean. Base Operations Support (BOS) and Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (SRM) were seriously underfunded based on requirements. Funding for FY 07-08 is much better because the rest of the Army was taxed to bring IMCOM up to a manageable standard. Many Senior Generals do not like IMCOM because of the money migration problem, but that migration problem has been fixed.

**Organization.** The initial organization of IMA was not bad, except it was an agency and not a command. The initial standup of 7 regions made sense at the time and with current Base Realignment Commission (BRAC) initiatives, the reduction to 5 makes even more sense. Additionally, the stand up of IMCOM with a 3 star commander is the best thing to happen to the organization. It provides IMCOM with a seat at the table with command authority. Though the IMCOM staff was too large initially and should be streamlined, at the beginning the workload was so large that this was required.

**Support from the Army.** Support from the Secretary of the Army is good. They fully understand the value of running the garrison as a business. They are promoting Lean Six Sigma throughout IMCOM and teaching it at the Army Management Staff College in the Garrison Pre-Command Course. When garrison commanders leave, most have a better attitude and idea of what and how IMCOM functions and how it can help them to function in a more efficient and effective manner.

**Standardization of Installation Support.** The standard garrison organization initiative is a good theory, but has application failures in some areas. All garrisons are not the same, they are unique and therefore, the individual garrison TDAs should reflect that particular mission. As examples, Fort Bragg has a large mobilization and deployment mission and Japan doesn't; Fort Belvoir has a Marina and Japan doesn't but it has a cultural awareness and bilateral mission



that requires promotion of places like Starbucks and Taco Bell. There are some garrisons that require a 05 commander in lieu of a 06 commander. Though they have the same functions, their staffs would be different. The distinction of large, medium or small garrisons was a step in the right direction to right size each garrison. Then there is the possibility in the future of civilianizing the garrison commanders positions which may be a problem when interacting with the Senior Mission Commanders.”<sup>3</sup>

### Why Installation Management?

The need for better Installation Management came to the forefront with the advent of Army Transformation. Army Transformations' objectives are to support the joint war fighting capability of the DOD via greater commonality and integration of business and financial operations; enable rapid access to information for strategic decisions using actionable information; reduce the cost of defense business operations by enabling decision makers via streamlined business processes to deal with the growing pressures on resources and improve financial stewardship to the American people by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of business processes to enable the Department to become better equipped and compliant with accountability laws and regulations. The focus for the Department was on priorities which would be enduring improvements to the Department's business, benefit the war fighter and continuously improve financial transparency and audit ability.<sup>4</sup> This involved transforming the management and command structure that supports the forces in the field. It led the Secretary of the Army to realign the Department of the Army with the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of Staff of the Army with their transformation efforts which began in 1999 and will continue beyond 2010. In the Headquarters, this meant the following:

- Formation of an Executive Office of the Headquarters to delineate responsibilities within Headquarters and streamline the flow of information and speed up decision making
- Establishment of a more powerful Director of the Army Staff, responsible for tasking and coordinating the entire Headquarters Staff to achieve objectives of Army leadership.
- Establishment of a Secretariat to establish direct linkages between policy and execution, assure unity of effort and support their counterparts.
- The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environments and the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) will centralize management of installations Army-wide through a system of regional directors.

Elements performing installation related functions in other parts of the Army Staff would transfer to ACSIM.<sup>5</sup>

While performing as a unified staff in executing policy, planning and resource management responsibilities, the Secretariat and Army Staff organizations will maintain their separate and discrete functions as required by law and making the Headquarters more integrated and responsive to rapidly changing institutional and operational missions.

#### Establishment of Installation Management

In order to face these challenges the Department decided to establish the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) in 2002 as the responsible official to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installations and Environment (ASA (I&E)) to provide advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&E) and other Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installations and Environment in addition to responsibilities and authorities as ACSIM on the Army Staff (ARSTAF) in executing policies, plans, and programs pertaining to Army Installations.<sup>6</sup> The Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management will manage installations and installation support services through establishment of the Installation Management Agency (IMA). Effective 1 October 2002, the Installation Management Agency was established as a field operating agency of the ACSIM. ACSIM functions include organizational alignments, manpower, doctrine, equipment, and functional responsibilities in support of the Transformation of Installation Management. The mission of the ACSIM is to provide policy guidance and program management on all matters relating to overall management and resourcing of Army installations worldwide. Ensure the availability of efficient, effective base services and facilities.<sup>7</sup>

Recognizing the requirement to enhance the support to commanders, then Secretary of the Army White directed the reorganization of the Army's management structure via a realignment task force, chartered in 2001. To accomplish this, Transformation of Installation Management (TIM) became effective in 2002. Transformation of Installation Management supports Army Transformation by allowing installations to become flexible enough to respond to any requirement.<sup>8</sup> In October 2002, the Army placed the management of Army installations under the Installation Management Agency (IMA). IMA is a new field operating agency of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM). Its mission is to provide equitable, efficient, and effective management of Army Installations worldwide to support readiness; enable the well-being of soldiers, civilians and family members: improve infrastructure; and preserve the environment. Again, this new management approach

eliminates the migration of bases operations funds to other operational accounts below the HQDA level. It also enables the development of multi-functional installations to support evolving force structure and Army Transformation needs.<sup>9</sup>

#### Establishment of Regions for Installation Management

To accomplish this dynamic change, the Transformation of Installation Management Initiative via the Installation Management Agency stood up seven Regions. The Installation Management Agency Headquarters would be located in Crystal City, VA., and the seven regions are:

- Northwest with headquarters at Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.
- Southwest with headquarters at Fort Sam Houston, Texas.
- Northeast with headquarters at Fort Monroe, VA.
- Southeast with headquarters at Fort McPherson, GA.
- Korea with headquarters in Yongsan.
- Pacific with headquarters at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.
- Europe with headquarters in Heidelberg, Germany.<sup>10</sup>

Under the Army's current structure, an installation commander is often dual-hatted, serving as both an installation and operational commander. Under Transformation of Installation Management, there will be two separate commanders – one who will control installation support money and one who will control operational and training dollars. The funds are to be separated so as not to cover shortfalls in either category.<sup>11</sup> The Senior Mission Commander is still the Installation Commander.

#### Issues in Standing up the Installation Management Agency

As with any new Agency or Organization there were and still are certain issues that cause significant pause and will require further thought in the implementation of Installation Management. These issues include but are not limited to:

- 1) Migration of funds
- 2) Organization
- 3) Culture changes concerning Installation Management acceptance and support of same by all involved
- 4) Support from the Army
- 5) Standardization of Installation Support
- 6) Integration of Lean Six Sigma

### Installation Management in 2002

Secretary White activated Installation Management as a Field Operating Agency (FOA) of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation management in 2002. As previously stated the purpose of IMA was to support readiness and mission execution in managing Army Installations that provide equitable services and facilities, optimize resources, sustain the environment and enhance the well-being of the military community.

IMA moved nearly 80,000 civilians and military members from 15 land owning major commands (MACOMs) to support the fledgling Agency. The effort of the IMA Human Resources (HR) Division, MACOM civilian personnel directors, the Civilian Personnel Operation Centers Management Agency, Installation Civilian Personnel Advisory centers and Military Personnel offices contributed to the success. At this time IMA Resource Management assumed responsibility for \$8 billion in funding previously controlled by the MACOMs. The Army Contracting Agency (ACA) was founded during this time and served as the Executive Agency for Department of the Army functions that included contingency contracting, business systems, A-76 policy, services contracting, purchase card and procurement management assessment and soon formed a mutually beneficial partnership with IMA via the awarding of blanket purchase agreements (BPAs) and consolidated contracts.<sup>12</sup> In 2002 the strength of the entire Installation Management community appropriated fund employees was 865. Military, Non-appropriated Fund and Contract employee figures were not available.<sup>13</sup>

### Installation Management in 2003

2003 marked the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and IMAs contributions to the Army mission took on a new dimension in this wartime environment. Throughout this period of fear and uncertainty, IMA successfully showed the Army's war fighting commanders that their troops could concentrate on the battlefield, confident in IMAs ability to manage the installations, support the mission and care for all those remaining in installation communities all over the world. IMA facilitated the mobilization, training, validation, deployment and billeting of more than 149,000 reserve component soldiers including 10,500 Continental United States (CONUS) support base, 3,900 training support, and 200 Continental United States replacement center personnel.

The well being of Soldiers in the field is a top IMA priority. It is especially crucial during wartime, when Soldiers combat effectiveness may be adversely impacted by fatigue, stress and homesickness. To ensure that Soldiers were supported by services and activities that allowed them to maintain their battle focus, IMA purchased and delivered \$13.5 million worth of Morale,

Welfare and Recreation (MWR) equipment, supplies and services for Soldiers and civilians involved in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)/Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The Agency went on to help place fitness and recreational facilities at forty-two sites in Iraq, eight in Afghanistan, and at each troop location in the Balkans.

Following these efforts, IMA threw its support behind the Army's reset program – restoring units to a desired level of combat capability commensurate with mission requirements and resource availability. In its first year, IMA brokered the repair or rehabilitation of over 64,000 pieces of critical equipment belonging to active and reserve units returning from or shipping out to deployments in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

One of the Agency's central mandates is affecting a culture of productivity improvement and cost management. IMAs Productivity Management Program, implemented in April 2003, became the linchpin of this overarching effort. The program required that all IMA Garrisons conduct quarterly Productivity Improvement Reviews (PIRs), assisting Garrison Commanders in identifying initiatives to improve operational efficiency and effectiveness. Garrison level PIRs began in September with Headquarters following in the Spring of 2004. IMAs first four month PIR cycle resulted in more than 800 initiatives for assessment and potential implementation, and potential cost savings or avoidance in excess of \$100 million for the next Fiscal Year (FY).<sup>14</sup> IMAs mission in 2003 became “provide equitable, effective and efficient management of Army Installations world wide to support mission readiness and execution, enable the well-being of Soldiers, civilians and family members, improve infrastructure and preserve the environment.” In 2003 the strength of the entire Installation Management community Appropriated Fund employees was 34,790. Military, Non-appropriated Fund and Contract employee figures were not available.<sup>15</sup>

#### Installation Management in 2004

With September 11<sup>th</sup> as a constant reminder of the need for American vigilance and resolution against the threat of terrorism, IMA recognized the need for a new way to manage installation security manpower requirements. The Agency implemented a multi-phased IMA contract Security Guard Program, leading the way in establishing contracts for security guards at twenty CONUS installations, freeing up 4,000 Soldiers – a number equivalent to 5 Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) from installation gate guard duties.

Steadfastly committed to the Global War on Terror (GWOT), the agency mobilized and demobilized approximately 340,000 Soldiers through its installations in 2004 – a figure two times greater than the size of US Army Europe in May 1945.

IMAs support of the American war fighter persisted. The Agency took control of the Army's medical holdovers (MHOs) – mobilized Reserve Component Soldiers unable to deploy or demobilize because of pre-existing or new medical conditions. IMA stepped in to begin providing life support facilities and base support services, plus command and control to approximately 5,000 Reserve Component soldiers. Roughly 76 percent were returned to duty and 24 percent separated.

Army statistics show that Soldiers on medical hold spend an average of one hundred and thirty days in the system. They must live and receive medical care at their mobilization station. IMA invested millions of dollars to upgrade and repair facilities to ensure housing for MHOs met the Secretary of the Army's (SA) standards. These requirements included a minimum of no more than four Soldiers to a room; internal latrines; climate control; and some degree of privacy. In addition, at many buildings lacking disability-accessibility facilities, IMA installed wheelchair accessible ramps and bathrooms.

2004 also saw the kick off of another IMA initiative. On 20 October, IMA presented its concept for Common Levels of Support (CLS) to the Installation Management Board of Directors (IMBOD). CLS is a strategy to guarantee delivery of high quality Base Operations Support Services within the funds available to the Army. The IMBOD quickly endorsed the concept for further development, and CLS began to take shape.<sup>16</sup> IMAs mission in 2004 was to "support mission readiness and execution; enable the well being of Soldiers, civilians and family members; improve infrastructure and preserve the environment." In 2004 the strength of the entire Installation Management community appropriated fund employees was 36,292. Military, Non-appropriated Fund and Contract employee figures were not available.<sup>17</sup>

#### Installation Management in 2005

In August 2005, Hurricane Katrina made landfall in southeast Louisiana and Mississippi. The storm killed approximately 1,577 people in Louisiana and 238 in Mississippi. While the coastlines of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana suffered nearly \$82 billion in damages, many military installations, including Fort Polk were also hard hit.

As Katrina raged, Fort Polk Garrison staff provided logistical support to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Louisiana National Guard and other federal agencies, ranging from billeting and airfields operations to manpower, food and water.

When the damage to Fort Polk was surveyed, IMAs Southwest region office dispatched a team of six of its most senior public works experts to this major training installation. The team fully assessed the damage and developed cost estimates for repairs. An extensive evaluation

of nearly 700 facilities showed that approximately 20 percent had suffered damage; however, having the Southwest engineers focus on damage evaluation allowed the local garrison staff to close ranks and re-direct their efforts to concentrate on addressing the immediate life, health and safety issues affecting the Soldiers, families, and civilians residing on the installations.

While Katrina's devastation wreaked havoc on military installations in the South, the routine passage of time was destroying others. Over the years, living conditions gradually degraded – the barracks on some installations were leaky, infested with mold and mildew and had broken heating units. IMAs commitment to matching the quality of a Soldier's home with the commitment that his or her service to the Nation is reflected in IMAs implementation of the first phase of a \$252 million Barracks Improvement Program (BIP). Its mission: to improve the living conditions for nearly for nearly 40,000 soldiers – roughly two divisions' worth – in 339 sub standard barracks on 29 installations by Fiscal Year 2007.

IMA identified 12 installations around the globe for the initial phase of the BIP: Forts Wainwright; Gordon; Stewart; Riley; Campbell; Polk; Bragg; Drum; Hood; Eustis; Lewis and Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

To leverage IMAs quantity buying potential in the interest of Soldiers, civilians, families and retirees, the Agency's MWR team structured the first centralized purchasing programs for both physical fitness equipment and golf cars. In 2005, fitness equipment savings from the program equaled \$269,000 on a \$1.6 million buy with savings in excess of \$550,000 on a purchase of \$4 million expected for 2006.

By the same token, the golf cart purchase program netted 1,079 golf carts with savings of nearly \$4.0 million over five years, on an \$11.2 million-purchase representing a 25 percent savings over the original government contract.<sup>18</sup> In 2005 the strength of the entire Installation Management community Appropriated Fund employees was 38,227. Military figures were not available. Non-appropriated Fund employees totaled 22,507. Local National employees totaled 11,505. This accounted for a total of 72,239 employees for the Installation Management Command worldwide. Contract employee figures were not available. Installation Management Command was authorized 43,814 employees.<sup>19</sup>

#### Installation Management in 2006

IMA takes a tremendous amount of pride in the great men and women in uniform who serve the Agency. In honor of those Soldiers, IMA names a Noncommissioned Officer (NCO) of the Year and a Soldier of the Year (SOY). The annual IMA Garrison Commanders' Conference

(GCC) in the Fall, serves as the venue to recognize the special qualities that make these soldiers stand apart from their peers.

Leadership also focuses on developing its civilian personnel and building a stable workforce. Since IMAs inception, 11 senior Service College graduates have come from the Agency's targeted Pool of GS-14's and 15's, and NF-5's. For the upcoming Academic Year 2006-07, IMA is represented by six students in these Senior Service Colleges: The Army War College (3), the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF) (1); Air War College (1) and the National War College (NWC (1). Three other IMA candidates were selected as alternates, representing the highest SSC selection rate in IMAs history. This figure also represents 14 percent of all SSC slots reserved for civilians. Additionally, the agency has also increased the number of Senior Executive Service (SES) individuals selected from within its ranks and is committed to growing that number.

Thanks to funding support to construct temporary Child Development Centers (CDCs), IMA began phase I of its Interim CDC initiative. Seven of these facilities are now open for business, and 18 are in preoccupancy stage and scheduled for opening by the end of the Fiscal Year (FY).

By year end, IMA will have developed 147 projects, completed 139 designs and awarded 75 contracts for a total investment of \$220 million – under the Training Barracks Improvement Program (TBIP). When completed, the Training Barracks Improvement Program will have funded one hundred and fifty three improvement projects at nineteen locations, improving living conditions for 86,000 trainees, annually.

In April 2006 GAO recommended that some changes to the oversight and management of contract Security Guards. They found that the Guards required training in revised anti-terrorism standards, better monitoring of criminal records check and reviews, standardized contractor recordkeeping and monitoring of weapons qualification training. DOD has agreed to these recommendations but has yet to implement them all.<sup>20</sup>

From its beginning, IMA has proudly answered its Call to Duty despite the unpredictable, uncertain worldwide conditions in which we live. IMA is honored to sustain, support and defend America's Army as it accomplishes its mission.<sup>21</sup> In 2006 the strength of the entire Installation Management community appropriated fund employees was 36,106. Military figures were not available. Non-appropriated Fund employees totaled 22,608. Local National employees totaled 9,608. This accounted for a total of 68,322 employees for Installation Management Command (IMCOM) worldwide. Contract employee figures were not available. Installation Management Command was authorized 43,765 employees.<sup>22</sup>



### Becoming the Installation Management Command – 2006

The Installation Management Agency received a lot of attention during 2006 as the Army struggled to find enough base operations money to keep installations providing the services that Soldiers and families expect. Funding shortages are not new to IMA—but the Army's Installation manager has managed cash flow crises for its entire four year life. During 2006, the Army validated IMAs role in managing installations by giving it full command authority as the Installation Management Command or IMCOM. The new command is headed by the Army's three star Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation management, who reports to the Secretary of the Army on installation issues, and encompasses the former Installation Management Agency (IMA), as well as the Community and Family Support Center and the Army Environmental Center. This change is expected to create a more effective, efficient and agile organization to ensure that the world's best Army is supported on the world's best installations. This transition at the end of IMAs fourth year offers a good opportunity to look at the short life of centralized installation management. Since IMA has operated largely behind the scenes, as IMCOM will, the Army world often sees IMA initiatives without knowing where they came from. IMCOM is intensively involved with Force generation, with training and deployment, with Army transformation, with base realignment and closure and with improving the quality of life for Soldiers and their families.

IMCOMs most pressing commitment to Soldiers and senior mission commanders is to focus it's efforts on providing the right set of critical services and either divesting the others or partnering with local communities to buy or share services.<sup>23</sup>

### Change in Regions Designation/Re-Organization

In the next few years IMCOM will shrink to two regions in the U.S. and consolidate most of the command at Fort Sam Houston, Texas in accordance with base realignment and closure law. The west region is slated to relocate with the headquarters at Fort Sam Houston, while the east region will reside at Fort Eustis, VA. The overseas regions will remain unchanged for the moment.<sup>24</sup>

### Installation Management Command in 2007

Some of the issues facing IMCOM yet to be resolved concern manpower and dollars to continue accomplishing their mission in the same manner that has led them in previous years. Since they have become a Command, these issues may be more easily resolved. 2007 has been designated the "Year of Manpower". At the initial planning phase of Centralized Installation Management (CIM)/Transformation of Installation Management (TIM), task forces

were established to construct an organization that would better serve the military requirements for Base Operations Support and help to manage the dollars flowing towards those particular efforts. Members of the Task Forces were told that the work force would not grow and in order to do this, employees in place on the mission side would be evaluated and moved to Base Operations.....this was being done largely to ensure the flow of dollars from Headquarters went directly to Base Operations Functions. Moving personnel required Human Resource personnel to ensure that the most qualified individuals were transferred to the Base support arena. It was not taken into account, however, that these individuals may not be adequately trained in Base Operations Functions.

### Findings/Recommendations

“Before IMA, the Army’s installation management world was fragmented. Garrison’s were operated by fourteen different MACOMs and had as many different sets of funding and people policies and procedures. Each MACOM had equally important missions and relied on the local General Officer to oversee the garrison operation. In almost all of the MACOMs funding of garrison operations took a back seat to the MACOM mission. The manning of the garrison staffs and determination of the actual manpower requirements became a difficult task as each garrison Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) differed from the next. The end result of these varied funding and manpower processes, both formal and informal was that support varied widely from installation to installation and the Army could not tell Congress or the taxpayer how much it really cost to operate an installation.”<sup>25</sup>

IMA was developed to standardize the base support processes so that the Army could compete equally for congressional funding. Ultimately the organization was to standardize service delivery to the Soldier and support Army Transformation efforts. “IMA took on this task, but not without problems. IMA was at that time a FOA and therefore could not exercise Command functions or maneuver funds. This caused the Army Staff to perform that function.”<sup>26</sup> Something as simple as training dollars became an issue and the Army G1 had to find the dollars to support this important function. As IMA as a FOA made itself more viable by growing the staff and convincing the Army Staff that it need to operate as a Command, IMCOM stood up.

Installation Management Command has done an in-dept review of its operations, training programs, regions and structure to ensure that qualified personnel are in the right position to make the Agency a more effective and efficient entity. IMCOM is going from IMA with 7 Regional offices to IMCOM with 6 Regions and 5 Regions by the year 2010 in accordance with

BRAC initiatives. The center of gravity in the Installation Management process is money and people. Understanding the processes associated with Appropriated Funds and Non-appropriated Funds and people are essential to lead and control the organization. IMA did not begin to fully manage its funding, in lieu of overseeing them, until 2004. They developed a web-based accounting tool appropriately named IMA on-line which in real time provided a view of the funding posture of garrisons. IMA on-line was made viable via standardized APCs within the cost accounting structure.

IMCOMs current key initiatives are to continue standardization of the Garrison Organization (SGO); provide common levels of support (CLS) and make this the year of manpower with efforts to par the Installation Management Command down to its Department of the Army authorized strength levels (36,350 civilians) to balance their appropriations with congressionally appointed figures; re-balancing in accordance with Army Transformation efforts and instituting Lean Six Sigma to become more effective and efficient. Again, ensuring dollars went to the correct accounts was at the very “basic” beginning of Installation Management Agency. As I look at the evolution of the Installation Management Command, the organization has grown far beyond the initial idea of specifying where dollars are allocated to include a tremendous growth in people (from 865 in 2002 to 68,322 in 2006). Though these figures may appear discouraging initially, it is evident in my opinion, that IMCOM is relevant and increasingly ready to continue the mission of base operations support for our to our most precious assets, the soldiers and their families.

“The Army’s Base Operations and Support program has a clear purpose and is guided by useful performance measures that ensure the Army can provide the critical services necessary to support the force during a time of war and with competing demands on available funds. The Army has managed to continue to provide critical services with little to no interruption, but has been less successful in providing the services it considers less than critical. Recent emphasis by the Army Chief of Staff to increase funding in the program will help address shortfalls in the less than critical services. Base Operations Support (BOS) programs appear to meet the needs of the Army, but the absence of common metrics makes it difficult to compare the Army’s Base Operations and Support program with that of other services or private enterprise. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is continuing to ensure development and definitions of performance measures for all base support services that are common across all military services.”<sup>27</sup>

Given that the Installation Management Command is a “young” agency, it is reviewing and changing in order to provide innovative, efficient and effective support. Though there is much more to be done in providing services, as a whole, we must understand that it will take time to

accomplish. IMCOM is invoking training, organizational change and contracting to accomplish this, while trying to manage their resources more efficiently. They are looking within to effect cultural changes that will in the long run ensure a more stable and efficient organization to include education of their employees, validation of requirements and authorizations by the U.S. Army Manpower Analysis Agency (USAMAA) and changes to the regional breakdown. Via Lean Six Sigma, IMCOM is constantly reviewing its organization, functions and processes to become a more efficient organization. It will be well worth the effort now and in the future.

Overall Army support is vital to the success of installation management. In the future, the installation will, more and more, be the 'launch platform' for our Force. The need for standardization of services, deployment operations, expansions capabilities are all part of where we need to focus Installation Management Agency efforts.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Philip E. Sakowitz, Executive Director, IMCOM, email interview with the author, 15 March 2007.

<sup>2</sup> John Koivisto, former Carlisle Barracks Garrison Commander, email interview with the author, 23 February 2007.

<sup>3</sup> Garland H. Williams, Commandant, Army Management Staff College, email interview with the author, 28 March 2007.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of the Army "Fact Sheet: Business Transformation Overview," U.S. Department of Defense, available from [http://www.dod.mil/dbt/facts\\_overview.html](http://www.dod.mil/dbt/facts_overview.html); Internet; accessed 16 January 2007.

<sup>5</sup> "Executive Summary: Realignment of Headquarters, Department of the Army," 17 December 2001.

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, "Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management," General Orders No. 4, 22 August 2002.

<sup>7</sup> Phillip Sakowitz, "Installation Management Command, IMCOM101: A Review," briefing slides, 19 December 2006, available from <http://www.imcom.army.mil/site/initiatives/default.asp>; Internet; accessed 22 January 2007.

<sup>8</sup> Jim Caldwell, "New Owner of Army Installations takes over Oct. 1" TRADOC News Service (29 March 2006); available from [http://www.mccoy.army.mil/vtraid\\_online/04122002/transformation%20of%20installation%20Management.htm](http://www.mccoy.army.mil/vtraid_online/04122002/transformation%20of%20installation%20Management.htm); Internet; accessed 11 January 2007.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, "Transformation of Installation Management (TIM)," 2003 United States Army Posture Statement, available from [http://www.army.mil/aps/realizing/readiness/installations/trans\\_inst.html](http://www.army.mil/aps/realizing/readiness/installations/trans_inst.html); Internet; accessed 11 January 2007.

<sup>10</sup> Candace Walters, "TIM is Changing the World of Installation Management," available from <http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/pubs/sep02/story6.htm>; Internet; accessed 11 January 2007.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Army Installation Management Agency, *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective* (Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Installation Management Agency, 20 June 2006). Hereafter cited as *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>13</sup> Philip DeMarais, Human Resources Directorate, HQs IMCOM, email interview, with the author, 20 February 2007. Hereafter referred to as DeMarais.

<sup>14</sup> *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>15</sup> DeMarais.

<sup>16</sup> *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>17</sup> DeMarais.

<sup>18</sup> *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>19</sup> DeMarais.

<sup>20</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office, "GAO Report," available from <http://www.gao.gov/docdb/lite/summary.php?rec>; Internet; accessed 28 March 2007.

<sup>21</sup> *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>22</sup> DeMarais

<sup>23</sup> Ned Christensen, "Soldier's Magazine Spotlights IMCOM," *Soldiers' Magazine* (November 2006).

<sup>24</sup> *Meeting the Challenge, a Five Year Retrospective*.

<sup>25</sup> Charles Munson, Deputy to the Commander, Fort A. P. Hill, email interview, with the author, 27 March 2007.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> "Program Assessment: Army Base Operations and Support," available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary/html>; Internet, accessed 27 March 2007.

